

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated March 20, 2008.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, U.S. Patent No. 6,507,366 in view of Loveland, U.S. Patent No. 6,437,819. Independent claim 1, from which the remaining claims each respectively depend, recites the limitations of “automatically increasing magnification of an image in response to initiating said object tracking system free from further user input while said object tracking system is activated” and “receiving a user selection of an object of interest in said image while said object tracking system is activated and said while said image is being automatically increased in magnification.” The applicant had previously argued that neither of these limitations were disclosed by the cited prior art. In the present rejection, the Examiner only responds to the first of these arguments, and ignoring the second quoted limitation entirely.

With respect to the first limitation quoted above, i.e. “automatically increasing magnification of an image in response to initiating said object tracking system . . .” the Examiner asserts that Lee’s disclosure of a cameral lens being automatically adjusted to the minimum focal distance of the lens, upon initialization, would increase magnification of the lens the very first time it was used. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The minimum focal length of a zoom lens typically occurs at the widest zoom setting for which the lens is capable, particularly with a wide-angle security camera. Although it is conceivable that a multi-element zoom lens could be specially designed so that its minimal focal length occurs at a zoomed-in position, such a lens would likely be targeted as a macro-lens for close-up photography. Wide angle lenses, such as those used in a security setting, will have a minimum focal length that coincides with the widest angle of the lens.

The applicant notes that neither cited reference expressly, implicitly, or inherently discloses a lens that has a minimum focal length that decreases as the camera is zoomed inwards. Nor can the Examiner contend that one of ordinary skill in the art would design a security system, such as that of Lee, to have such a lens, as to do so would frustrate the purpose of a security camera, which is to have as wide a focal range as possible.

In any event, as noted in applicant's prior response, no cited prior art reference discloses the limitation of "receiving a user selection of an object of interest in said image while said object tracking system is activated and *while said image is being automatically increased in magnification.*" (emphasis added). The claimed method automatically increases magnification of the camera lens when the tracking system is activated, and continues to zoom until a user designates an object to be tracked. Adjustment of the lens of Lee to the minimum focal length is finished before the user designates any object to be tracked. The Examiner has failed to respond to this argument, which as noted earlier was raised in the applicant's prior amendment. The applicant has further amended claim 1 to clarify this limitation, by reciting "receiving a user selection of an object of interest in said image while said object tracking system is activated and said while said image is being automatically increased in magnification in response to said initiating said tracking system."

For each of the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-20, patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art. The applicant has canceled previously withdrawn claims 27-29. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631